THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XXXVI OCTOBER 22, 1938 No. 860

Socialized Medicine

WILFRID PARSONS, S.J.

Reprinted from Columbia, *September, 1938.*

HERE in Washington as I write, the unusually high temperature (with appropriate humidity) has risen in all the doctors' offices because the Department of Justice has just taken the unprecedented step of instituting an anti-trust suit against the District of Columbia Medical Society and the American Medical Association for restraint of trade. The immediate occasion of the suit was a row that had arisen between the District Society and a New Deal creation known as the G.H.A., which is short for Group Health Association. The doctors, and some of the hospitals, will have none of the G.H.A., and in private, at least, look on it with some ire as just another Communist scheme, hatched by the bright young men who are known as the "Brain Trust."

Nobody has yet suggested that the Brain Trust be dissolved as being itself also a restraint of trade, but the medical profession would like to see some action along that line. For this is the first time to my knowledge that the principles of industrial competition have

been forcibly injected into the profession of medicine. The doctors were stupefied by this indication of the new age, though outside of their ranks others would be very much surprised if the anti-trust suit against them ever comes to trial. What seems more likely at this writing is that the Department of Justice is hoping that the Medical Society will capitulate, sign some sort of a consent decree, according to the best practice among the cosmetic manufacturers and the meat packers, and leave the G.H.A. in peace to grow up as any well-behaved brain child of a New Deal Trust should.

What is this G.H.A.? It is a sort of cooperative insurance society formed among the employes of one of the Government agencies, according to which they will be guaranteed health examinations, and treatment in case of illness. It has already had one test in court; but the doctors who are not employed by it still look upon it with deep suspicion. But after all, there is nothing new with the idea. It has been around for some time. What was new about this particular group-medicine enterprise was that if not founded, it was certainly fostered, by the Government itself. That makes a difference. For, however hostile or amiable you may feel toward the idea of group medicine in itself, you must admit that there is a vast difference between such a group formed and run by private initiative and one run by the Government. The latter would be socialized medicine with a vengeance; and for many months socialized medicine has been a bugbear to the medical profession beyond anything it has yet encountered. For that reason, organized medicine in the District of Columbia has felt that it was on the front of the firing line. If the thing which was just being started here succeeded in what it was doing, it would be no time at all before the same thing would spring up all over the country and we would have such semi-official (or maybe official?) groups monopolizing medi-

cine in the name of the Government. Instead of being an independent and rather proud profession, the doctors would be just so many more government employes.

Now nobody expects our doctors to be good politicians, and we would be rather disappointed in them if they turned out to be that. But it must be admitted that they have not in every case met this menace, for menace it is, in a very adroit manner. Their first reaction to any suggestion along the line of group practice, or social cooperation in medicine, private or public, has usually been one of rather hurt surprise, as if they had been singled out for something special and made a target for some new experiment which a strange and hitherto unknown ideology was foisting on them specially.

In this I take the liberty of thinking that they have made a mistake. They will not ward off this menace by ignoring it, and still less by merely getting angry at it. Dr. Morris Fishbein, the editor of the *Journal* of the American Medical Association, is a very clever man, and his speeches on this subject are full of what in less professional society would be called wisecracks. But this is a movement that is deeply imbedded in the evolution of our times, and it behooves them to take a more serious and less superficial view of it. If, as I believe, the movement is a deep ground swell coming up from the depths of the consciousness of all the peoples of the world, then it is something that cannot be fought off with clever sophistries or indignant scorn.

After all, the doctors are not the only ones who are feeling this pressure for social action. In fact, they are almost the last. Let all those business men who weathered the NRA tell them what it means. And if they will take a look at Europe, they will find that we here are only at the beginning of something new

in the world. The old individualism which was once called Liberalism, and is now called reactionism, is dead; no less a person than Pope Pius XI pronounced it dead in his encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*.

I admit that you expect more individualism in a profession like medicine, and of course that profession is perhaps the most individualistic in the world. It is grounded on a personal relation between physician and patient, and nothing can be more individual than that, except perhaps it be that between penitent and confessor in the Church. But the materialistic world is beginning to look on it as a matter of dollars and cents, just like any other business transaction. I do not know if that development is the fault of the doctors or not; but it is too late in any event to change it. Perhaps a long campaign of propaganda, stressing the spiritual aspects of medicine, might do something about it, but I doubt it.

The present world is in a mood to treat the payment it makes its physicians in the same spirit it uses toward all other payments; and the movement to socialize medicine is no different from the movement to socialize everything else, and unless something intelligent is done about it, it will engulf medicine as well as industry.

Now it seems to me that we can look for some wisdom on this point from someone who at first glance might seem to have little to say about it. I mean Pope Pius XI. It is true that he nowhere to my knowledge has directly treated of this particular problem which we have come to recognize as socialized medicine. But he has treated very directly of the movement to socialize society, and medicine is a very important part of society. I think that the principles he lays down on the wider problem may have a very direct bearing on this narrower problem. After all, a

principle is a principle and its applications should have universal meaning.

Now, in treating of the relations between the various classes of society, Pope Pius remarked that every one of these relations has two aspects, an individual one and a social one. Labor has an individual aspect, the earning of a man's living, and a social one, the effect his product has on the world at large. And he says that capital has the same two aspects: an individual one in the profits a man makes out of it, and a social one, the effects that its operations have on society. He then goes on to say that you must not stress either of these two aspects to the detriment of the other. If you put all your emphasis on the individual aspect you will have all the evils that followed in the train of capitalism in the past century, and perhaps an ultimate blow-up of society in rebellion against those evils. But if you look only on the social aspect, and treat the individual as nothing, then you will plunge into Socialism with all the tyrannical despotism of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the rest of it. The conclusion he draws from this is that you must learn to look on the two aspects at once. Labor must think both of its individual and its social responsibilities; and so must capital. So must every other activity of man. The twin evils of Individualism and of Socialism stand there to grasp us on either side if we do not.

Now up to about the World War the trend was altogether in thinking of these human activities in their individual aspects. That was what was called Liberalism. The trouble with it was that it is based on some kind of Darwinian evolutionary theory of the survival of the fittest; when you just leave all the individuals of society to scramble for the prizes of life without any hindrance, and without any sense of responsibility to society as a whole, you will get what we got: an overbalanced economy with the wealth of

the world in too few hands, and the enormous majority of mankind in the position of mere precarious breadwinners.

There was bound to be a reaction against that sooner or later; and after the War it came. It came in the form of a swing of the pendulum to the other extreme, and everywhere there arose a tendency to collectivize everything. Whether that collectivist movement took the form of Communism or of Fascism, it made little difference. The thing is an evil, precisely for the same reason that Individualism was an evil: it is only a partial solution; it overlooks the other half of the problem. Each is a violation of man's nature. Take only a part of that nature and it will turn and rend you. It must be taken as a whole if the affairs of man are to be run with justice and peace.

What has all this to do with the medical profession? First of all, medicine has been subject to the hoary evil of individualism, just as the rest of our society has been. On the other hand, it is no solution of the medical problem, or of any other social problem, to revise society or any part of it wholly on the social basis. Medicine must recognize its social responsibility as well as its individual character and rights. If it does not do that, it will be the target for every agitator who wishes to foist on us the purely partial, and therefore false, socialist solution.

In fact, I venture to state that it will be even more of a target maybe than other sections of society, for a very special reason. Just at present, the Communists are engaged in trying to crack the toughest nut that has yet faced them. They have everywhere found that where they organize and grow strong, the inevitable reaction is that the middle class organizes in opposition and thus creates what we call Fascism. In order to forestall this in the future the Communists have adopted a new policy—that of the United Front.

This appeal is particularly to the once-hated bourgeoisie, the middle class which has some sort of stake or close connection with private property. A dozen different societies have been formed by them with high-sounding and unsuspicious names, like League for Peace and Democracy, whose sole purpose is to organize the middle class in such a way that the Communists, who control each of these societies, may guide the trend of society away from Fascism and toward Communism. They have even got to calling themselves democrats, in the pathetic but hopeful expectation that this will make middle-class people more kindly disposed toward them.

Now this movement is having some success. It may not in the end bring us to Communism, but in the meantime it will make a lot of people unhappy. The stirring up of dissatisfaction is a necessary prelude to any kind of revolution, and at doing just that the Communists have no superiors. For this reason, if for no other, it behooves the medical profession to take cognizance of the growing awareness of large masses of white collar workers that they are not getting a square deal in the matter of health. The poor are cared for gratis, out of private charity and out of taxes. The rich are able to pay for what they want and desire. But everybody knows a half-dozen families where the children's adenoids or tonsils, or whatnot, are not being cared for, because the breadwinner of the family is just making enough to keep the home up to the standard of living which it is accustomed to, and so medical care is frequently the last thing to come into the picture—after the automobile, the radio, the electric refrigerator, and the annual vacation.

It is to families in this class that the appeal for socialized medicine has tremendous force. It is among these that various forms of group medicine are springing up. It is a natural evolution—the human mind

naturally thinking in terms of social action after individual action has failed. If, instead of opposing these natural movements among the middle class of people, organized medicine were to spring into it and guide it according to the ethics and experience of the profession, it would not now be faced with the prospect of suits for restraint of trade. If, in other words, medicine will take stock of itself and see that its best interests consist neither in an excess of individualism nor in socialism, but in a proper attention to both these aspects of human life at the same time, then it will have warded off what is certainly a grave menace to it—the subjection of the profession to a political bureaucracy.

Now I know very well that perhaps no other group of men in the world practice so much unobtrusive private charity as the physicians. It is a noble tradition among them, and one that has been nobly followed, that no person in need shall be deprived of medical care because of lack of money to pay for it. It is for this reason, if for no other, that none of us want to see medicine made a department of state. But, as things are, either one of two things is going to happen if the medical profession does not take preventive action. Either the patients are going to organize and in a group employ the physicians who are willing to treat them as a group; or the government is going to organize the physicians themselves and direct their activities to the patients as some bureaucracy will decide. The old individualism is gone. Will the medical profession forestall the two alternatives by organizing itself for social action which will fulfil the twofold—individual and social—responsibility of its members?

Therapeutic Abortion

E. J. MAHONEY

Reprinted from the Clergy Review, *London, June, 1938.*

THE Church, interpreting the divine law, teaches that direct abortion, *i. e.*, the expulsion of an enviable fetus, is forbidden even when it is done to save the life of the mother.

It appears necessary, in the first place, to eliminate certain aspects of the matter which are either irrelevant to the chief problem or which are liable to deflect our attention from it. There exists a whole group of casuistical questions, ranging from the simple excision of a cancerous womb to the problem of the ectopic fetus. In nearly all such cases the right solution turns on an intelligent application of the "double effect" principle. It is lawful, namely, to perform an operation from which the death of the fetus indirectly follows, provided that the immediate object of the operation is good, that the intention is good, and that there is a proportionately grave reason for so acting. In many instances of this kind the right solution is apparent to the merest novice in the study of ethics. The death of the fetus results from some surgical operation, or from some medical treatment, in which the causing of abortion is clearly neither an end in itself nor a means to an end. The chief point is simply to discover whether the operation would be performed even though the woman were not pregnant. In other rarer cases the solution is not at all obvious and certain, even to skilled professional theologians. The situation is freely discussed, chiefly in our periodical literature, and when an agreed solu-

tion is discovered it will be due to establishing the finest of distinctions between what is the direct effect and what is indirect. It is sometimes appallingly difficult to determine such a distinction and, more often than not, the result will appear to the ignorant or the uninformed as a most contemptible exercise in hair-splitting. But the same may be said of any individual case which has to be settled with the aid of legal principles. To the trained legal mind the judgments of the Court of Appeal are often wise and luminous decisions, accurately determining the law as applied to a given case; to the lay mind, and especially to the mind of the losing party, the application of the law often seems to be the height of absurdity—"the law is an ass."

In the matter we are discussing, the teaching of the Church is derived from two simple ethical principles: that the slaying of the innocent is an evil thing and that we may never, in the words of Saint Paul, do evil that good may come. Putting aside the rarer and the more difficult cases arising from applying the principle of the double effect, we are here concerned with establishing the application of these ethical principles to the wrong of procuring abortion directly as a therapeutic measure, for example, where the evacuation of the uterus is held to be necessary in order to save the life of a patient with pulmonary tuberculosis.

Amongst the reasons which, outside the Catholic Church, are sometimes felt to offer exceptions to the commandment of God, "Thou shalt not kill," are those of a *eugenic* order: the feeling is that abortion is justified in order to prevent the birth of unhealthy progeny. Other reason may be of the social *order*: sympathy for an unmarried mother may be so strong that it is felt that recourse to abortion is necessary in order to save her reputation.

The theologian is most deeply concerned for Cath-

olics confronted with the grievous dilemma of choosing between professional and moral considerations. It is a sympathy which takes the form of trying to find a way out, by stretching the principles to their utmost limit; by laboring to establish, if it is possible, that the death of the fetus is merely an indirect effect of a lawful action; even by permitting people sometimes to remain in good faith, as Prummer wisely suggests,[1] though the possibility of ignorance is extremely unlikely in these days. What I mean to say is that the wild and unmeasured clerical denunciation of the murder of the innocent, is sometimes in inverse proportion to accurate knowledge, both medical and theological.

Catholics in the medical profession are entitled to our sympathetic consideration, for there are few classes of the community which are called on to pay so dearly for their loyalty to moral principles. But the simple truth remains that doctors and nurses, no less than other people, are subject to the law of God; as Catholics, they are bound, no less than other people, to accept the guidance of the Church which determines for us all, in the more difficult cases, what the law of God forbids. There is a growing tendency, chiefly in non-Catholic circles, to concede to the medical profession a favored position with regard to the moral law, so that what is wrong for an ordinary person to do becomes right when done in the name of medicine or surgery. A much discussed novel has recently exposed some alleged practices in certain branches of these professions, methods of growing rich which are immoral because they are dishonest and forbidden by the seventh commandment. If the theme of this novel casts a slur on the whole profession of medicine, the imputation is manifestly cruel and unjust.

---

1 *Theol. Moralis*, II, Section 186.

It would be as reasonable to conclude that the Catholic priesthood is on the whole unchaste, because of a novel dealing with the life of an incontinent priest. But *The Citadel*, even if it contains only an infinitesimal degree of just comment, does illustrate a very profound truth, namely, that doctors are expected to be as honest as any other men, and the result of disregarding the moral law in this respect is to degrade a noble profession. What is true of the seventh commandment is equally true of the fifth commandment. The natural law forbidding the direct killing of the innocent admits of no exception. Doctors are as much bound by it as anyone else is bound; if they choose to disregard it they are choosing a line of conduct which will certainly degrade their profession.

The circumstances in which a therapeutic abortion is caused by a reputable surgeon are admittedly very complex and very disturbing to the mind. Unless one holds very tenaciously certain simple principles, one's judgment can quite easily be diverted not only from the straight path of moral conduct but from the equally straight path of logical thought and deduction. These circumstances are very desperate in cases where it is feared or foreseen that the mother as well as the child will die unless the pregnancy is terminated; the arguments in favor of abortion in such cases can be put very persuasively. I do not know whether those who use these arguments will take it as a compliment to their intelligence or an insult, but the truth is that certain Roman theologians, notably Ballerini, elaborated these same arguments half a century ago, and they did so with a degree of subtlety which is generally lacking in their modern exponents.[2] The view was defended that, in certain circumstances, it was lawful to kill the fetus. It was advanced tentatively,

[2] Ballerini, *Opus Morale*, Vol. II, pp. 647-655; Eschbach, *Disputationes*, Vol. II, Disp. iv.

and merely as a probable opinion, but it was never endorsed by theological writers generally, and was eventually rejected by the Holy See.[8]

The arguments used may be expressed briefly on these lines. Of two evils we should choose the lesser: it is preferable for the fetus to die rather than for both mother and fetus to die. We may endorse this outlook at once. It is undoubtedly preferable for the fetus to die; we may desire it to die; we may hope and pray that it may die. But dying is a very different thing to being killed. To kill the fetus is to do something intrinsically evil that good may come, the wrongfulness of which is universally admitted. The harshness of the conclusion in this case becomes less so if we apply the principle to more familiar situations. It is not permitted to kill a man dying of infectious disease on a ship rather than suffer the other passengers to die as well, though it is preferable that he should die before infecting the others. If two drowning men are holding on to a plank which can only preserve one, it is not permitted to a third party to strike one of them dead lest both should perish. In both cases the moral judgment of any ordinary man would direct him to stand by and do nothing rather than assume the prerogatives of God. The doctor is not exempted from observing this moral law. He will use all his skill in an attempt to save both mother and child by every lawful means, but if he has any regard for the law of God, he will not slay the child to save its mother; nor, if such circumstances can ever occur, will he slay the mother to save the child. If it is wrong to kill a child outside of the womb it is wrong to kill it within. It may be urged, and with truth, that the death of the fetus is merely being accelerated, since it is going to die in any case if the mother's life cannot be saved.

[8] May 24, 1884; August 19, 1888; July 24, 1895. *Cf.* Gasparri, *Fontes*, n. 1173.

The point is quite a strong one and its essential weakness is only perceived when we reflect that any kind of killing is an acceleration of death, since every human being in this world has got to die sooner or later. Directly to hasten the death of the innocent is precisely what is forbidden by the fifth commandment. We live in times when life is held rather cheaply and all kinds of extreme views are being promulgated. But it is still true to say that the moral judgment of most men forbids killing those who are dying, even though their death is accelerated only by a few hours. The doctor, like everybody else, is bound by this law.

We have been arguing from the familiar to the unfamiliar, trying to preserve a reasonable judgment, not allowing it to be swept aside by circumstances or sentiment. The same method is open to one who is trying to justify direct killing of the fetus; he may argue from instances in which killing is permitted. I imagine that no one would attempt to show that a state of war exists between the fetus and its mother or her doctor! Nor could anyone reasonably argue that it is a case of applying to a malefactor the death penalty, after the manner of capital punishment. In any case, it is clear that no doctor would claim to be a commander-in-chief, or a criminal judge with power over life and death; still less would he care to be regarded as a public executioner. It is, nevertheless, quite remarkable how the untidy minds of some people do work in this direction: human beings are killed in war and criminals are put to death by the State—what is to prevent the fetus being killed by a doctor? But there is one instance of justifiable homicide which does appear to offer a certain parity with feticide. It is taught by the Church, and the teaching is sanctioned by every civil code, that it is permissible, in defending one's own life, to slay an unjust aggressor if no other less drastic means of self-defense can be em-

ployed. If we suppose that the unjust aggressor is a homicidal lunatic, quite irresponsible for his actions, the parity with a fetus threatening the mother's life seems to be perfect. It was, in fact, chiefly from this angle that the Roman theologians already mentioned argued their case.

The theoretical justification of the doctrine permitting an unjust aggressor to be killed is not very satisfactory in the manualist treatment of the subject.[4] This much is, at least, beyond dispute. The infliction of death on the aggressor in these circumstances is not a retribution for his sin—not an act of vindictive justice; it is objectively and in itself an act of self-defense. It is, therefore, irrelevant, whether he is formally guilty as an unjust aggressor, or whether, being a lunatic, his aggression is only materially unjust. Moreover, the right to kill in self-defense would be rather useless if it were first necessary to ascertain whether the aggressor was mad or sane. In either case his action is objectively an action threatening the life of the person attacked. Whether he is sane or not the character of the action is the same; it is an unjust aggression upon another person's right to live, since the aggressor is actually doing something which he has no right to do, and very often he is in a place where he has no right to be. He is acting outside his rightful sphere.

The fetus can never be considered in the light of a materially unjust aggressor, because it is more passive than active; it has a natural right to be where it is and is living in accordance with the natural laws of its

[4] Dr. Van Hove, in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 1929, p. 655, has admirably clarified this teaching. He decides that the right to kill in these circumstances is derived from one's obligations towards the public or common good of society, which would otherwise be gravely threatened. The doctrine is not applicable to the case of a mother killing her offspring in order to save her own life, not only because the fetus is not an unjust aggressor, but because the common good is not at stake. On the contrary, the common good requires that direct abortion should never be permitted.

being. It is living and growing in the place where nature, or—if you like—where its mother has placed it. The doctrine of the unjust aggressor cannot be invoked in order to kill the fetus. If there exists a conflict of rights between mother and fetus, it could be said, quite improperly though with much more of the appearance of truth, that the mother is the unjust aggressor.

The positive law of the Church punishes the crime of abortion with excommunication. But the prohibition is not itself a positive law. The Church did not make the law and has no power to alter it. Still less does the public authority of the State possess any power to alter it. It is the duty of the State to protect the lives of the innocent, including those who are not yet born. If the civil law permits their death at the hands of doctors, it must be remembered that God is the Judge and the Avenger of innocent blood. Men can freely depart from the law of God, but they do so at their peril and at the peril of the whole community. Apart from a few extremists, most people hold that abortion is wrong as a general rule of conduct, whether they believe in God or not. A reputable doctor will not cause or counsel abortion in a normal pregnancy, for the sake of the mother's reputation or convenience, because the evil of abortion far outweighs the mother's good. In the teaching of the Church, the moral evil of killing the innocent fetus is greater than the physical evil of the mother's death.

This appears to many to be a very harsh interpretation of the law. But law, in its ancient and classical definition, is an ordinance of reason made for the common good, and quite often it appears to be harshly incident on an individual. Sentiment must not be allowed to take the place of reason in the interpretation of laws, nor must the common good be jeopardized for the sake of any individual.

Emmanuel—God With Us

MOST REV. JOSEPH J. RUMMEL, D.D.

Extracts from address delivered over the Catholic Hour. Station WEAF. As issued by the N. C. W. C. News Service.

FIRM, unequivocal, and constant is the doctrine of the Catholic Church that the Holy Eucharist contains the body and the blood, the soul and the divinity of Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Son of God, under the forms of bread and wine. Nothing short of this belief will explain or justify the liturgy, the prayers, the customs of the Church. Her most solemn functions as well as the simple devotional practices in which her children find delight, strength, and solace, are inspired by the doctrine of the Real Presence. . . .

The doctrine . . . expressed by Christ was novel, and the congregation at Capharnaum found it hard to accept its clear significance. Even for some of the disciples it proved a stumbling-block. They were evidently preoccupied about the manner in which Christ's body and blood could become food and nourishment. They lacked faith in His wisdom, goodness, and power, infinite resources which would find the way, even as on the day previous He had found the way of "healing them that were in need of healing," and of feeding the five thousand weary, hungry people that, heedless of their physical wants, had followed Him into the desert near Bethsaida. With Saint Peter and the Apostles, whose faith Christ challenged with the question: "Will you also go away?" The Church has ever answered: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed,

and have known, that Thou art the Christ, the Son of God" (John vi, 66-70). Yes, faith in Christ is the key to the Mystery of the Eucharist!

Christ chose the Paschal Supper as the setting for His leave-taking from the Apostles. They were not aware of the impending tragedy, but He knew that on the morrow, ere another sun would have set upon Jerusalem's proud domes and pinnacles, His body would hang limp and lifeless upon a cross raised over the Hill of Skulls. Under such circumstances Jesus could be in no other mood but that of solemn earnestness, sincerity, and frankness. He was about to proclaim His testament, the testament of the God-man on the eve of His death. Hence the least suspicion of deception or vagueness must be eliminated from His actions and words, the words of the Incarnate God about to die.

With simple majesty "Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke: and gave to His disciples, and said: Take ye, and eat. This is My body. And taking the chalice, He gave thanks, and gave to them, saying: Drink ye all of this. For this is My blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi, 26-28). Here was the reward of Peter's faith: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." Here was the answer to all those who had even the slightest misgiving either regarding the reality of Christ's promise or regarding the manner of its fulfilment. His flesh becomes meat indeed, His blood drink indeed; but the manner is lovingly considerate, divinely humane. Common bread retains the form of bread, while its substance is changed into the substance of the Body of the Saviour. It becomes the Bread of Life, the living Bread that came down from heaven, Jesus Christ the Son of God. And this change of substance, which leaves unchanged the appearance or form, is effected

continuously in the Church by the priest in virtue of the power contained in the words, "Do this for a commemoration of Me" (Luke xxii. 19). . . .

When the Prophet Isaias foretold the advent of the Messias, he said: "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel" (Isaias vii, 14). Saint Matthew the Evangelist gives us the meaning of this designation, saying: "Which being interpreted, is *God with us*" (Matt. i, 23). This prophecy—"God with us"—was literally fulfilled in the Incarnation of the Son of God. Thereby the human nature was hypostatically united to the divine, and the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity became in a real manner associated with the human race, adding to it for all time a dignity unique in the realm of creation and unparalleled in the annals of God's dealing with men.

But in the Holy Eucharist that prophecy of Isaias —"Emmanuel or God with us"—receives even a more emphatic realization. It is to the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist that the words of Wisdom can be applied with genuine reality: "My delights *were* to be with the children of men" (Prov. viii, 31). "Emmanuel—God with us" is the inspiration of the architect and the artist in their joint aim to make the church indeed a "House of God," in which dwells not only the glory of the Lord as in a cloud (3 Kings viii, 12), but Jesus Christ the Son of God, really, truly, and substantially present under the sacramental species in the tabernacle. . . .

"Emmanuel—God with us" draws to the sanctuary and tabernacle the little child that seeks health and healing for an ailing mother or some great grace for a troubled father. In that sacred presence kneel the stalwart youth and the graceful maiden, each to implore light, guidance, and strength in the momentous decision of life's calling, confident that He who dwells

within the tabernacle walls hears and sees, understands, and never fails to help. . . .

"Emmanuel—God with us" is the magnet which in the last sixty years has attracted with increasing force and frequency the millions of faithful who participate with enthusiasm in Eucharistic Congresses. No phenomenon in the devotional life of the Church has grown with greater rapidity and intensity than have these Congresses since their inception in Lyon, France, June 21, 1881. Since that date the International Congresses alone have practically encircled the globe, creating in the important centers of the world, religious interest and fervor comparable to the holy zeal aroused by the crusades in the Middle Ages. With an equally intense spirit of faith and sacrifice Eucharistic Congresses have been organized for nations, provinces, and diocese, followed by far-reaching results for the spiritual, moral, and social betterment of the respective areas.

Faith in "Emmanuel—God with us" dominates the entire program of these Eucharistic Congresses. . . . A Eucharistic Congress becomes the occasion for a deep religious revival in the best sense of the word and the source of benediction to all who are touched ever so remotely by its spirit.. May light, life and strength of will descend upon the nation, our governing authorities, our fellow citizens, to the end that our steps may move in righteousness towards peace, safety, and prosperity under the unfailing guidance of "Emmanuel —God with us." May the Congress be the means of directing our attention to the tabernacle, where Christ rules in simple majesty, in meekness and lowliness, yet with Sovereign power and inexhaustible mercy. To Him may our hearts be drawn in love, in devotion, in confidence, and in undying loyalty.